

REMARKS

By the present Amendment, claims 1-11 are cancelled and claims 12-22 are added. This leaves claims 12-22 pending in the application, with claim 12 being independent.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) for allegedly failing to illustrate the cement layer of original claim 9. However, such layer is the adhesive layer 18 described in the specification and illustrated in the drawings. Claim 20 recites an adhesive layer, rather than a cement layer, to avoid this objection more clearly.

Substitute Specification

The specification is revised to avoid the objections raised in the Office Action and to eliminate grammatical and idiomatic errors in the originally presented specification. The number and nature of the changes made in the specification would render it difficult to consider the case and to arrange the papers for printing or copying. Thus, the substitute specification will facilitate processing of the application. The substitute specification includes no “new matter”. Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 608.01(q), voluntarily filed, substitute specifications under these circumstances should normally be accepted. A marked-up copy of the original specification is appended hereto.

Additionally, the specification is also objected to for failing to refer to the cement layer. This objection is overcome by claim 20 reciting an adhesive layer.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to be based on an enabling description relative to the coating, which coating will improve adhesion of the

mold foam to rods 38. In this regard, the originally filed specification adequately describes, in the last paragraph, a coating having a gradient action. Such description would enable those skilled in the field of such coatings to make and use the claimed invention now recited in claims 21-22.

Original claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. By the present Amendment, the originally filed claims have been rewritten to avoid the language alleged to be indefinite in the Office Action. All language of the presently pending claims is now believed to be clear and definite.

Thus, the pending claims are definite and comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 12 combines the limitations for original claims 1 and 2, thereby constituting original 2 rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112. Thus, claim 12, as well as dependent claims 13-22, should now be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, claims 12-22 are allowable. Prompt and favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark S. Bicks
Reg. No. 28,770

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, LLP
1300 19th Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: April 6, 2009